

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 30, 2003, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 20 and 22 through 24 are currently pending in the application. Claim 21 has been canceled. Claims 1 through 24 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 19 and 22, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,539,452 to Bush et al. in view of JP 01-252087A to Nakajima

Claims 1 through 3, 5 through 13, and 15 through 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bush et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,452) in view of Nakajima (JP 01-252087A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejections of claims 1 through 3, 5 through 13, and 15 through 24 are improper because, at the very least, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the presently claimed invention as set forth hereinabove. Applicants submit that any proposed combination of the Bush reference and the Nakajima reference does not teach or suggest the claim limitations of the respective amended independent claims.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10

Applicants, in amended independent claim 1 and claims 2, 3 and 5-10 depending therefrom, claim:

1. A video conferencing circuit for use with a plurality of video input devices and a video output device, said video conferencing circuit comprising:
video input means **configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices**; . . .
an application specific integrated circuit (ASIC) connected to said video input means, . . . said ASIC having:
a **video-in circuit** connected to said video input means **to receive said input video signal from one of said plurality of video signal generating devices**,
a **memory circuit** connected to said video-in circuit **to receive said input video signal**, said memory circuit being **configured to retain and transmit said input video signal** as stored data,
data compression means . . ., video processing means . . ., video decompression means . . ., and video image out means . . . (Emphasis added.)

Applicants' invention as claimed includes a **"video input means configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices"** and that selected input video signal is individually passed and processed through the other elements of the invention as claimed.

In contrast, Bush discloses:

a video telephone system in which . . . [v]ideo and audio information are transmitted simultaneously by means of a composite signal that includes a mixture of both video data and audio data . . . so that expensive synchronization hardware need not be incorporated . . . (Col. 4, lines 39-51).

Specifically, Bush matches one video signal with one audio signal and mixes them together to maintain synchronicity between the video and the corresponding audio. Bush does not disclose **"select[ing] an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices . . ."** as claimed by Applicants. Additionally, Bush is not motivated to select a video signal from among a plurality of video signals as Bush is motivated to **"mix"** signals rather than **"select one"** signal.

Regarding the Nakajima reference, Nakajima discloses a video conferencing system that is able to discard the extra video display that was previously dedicated for displaying the local

(“own place”) video signal. Nakajima does so by superimposing the image of the local video signal in a lesser-important portion of the video display dedicated to projecting the remote video signal in a video conferencing configuration. Nakajima further discloses that the conferencing system on the local and remote sides of the conference includes: “TV cameras 1a and 1b for [local] [] control[], the . . . **output from the cameras 1a and 1b** is synchronized with a separation picture by a synchronizing signal converter 12 controlled by the separation generator 10 **and supplied to respective mixers 11a and 11b**. To respective displaying monitors 7a and 7b, the split picture of an **opponent side picture is mixed** and displayed and an own place side picture is mixed and displayed to the ineffective part of the monitors 7a and 7b.” (Abstract).

Specifically, Nakajima and Bush both disclose “mixing” the multiple signals rather than “selecting one” of the multiple signals. Since neither Bush nor Nakajima either individually or in any proper combination teach or suggest a “video input means **configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices . . .**” as claimed by Applicants in amended independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that any rejection of the presently claimed invention based upon any combination of the Bush reference and the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, presently amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-10 depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the cited prior art of the Bush reference in view of the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 11-13 and 15-20

Applicants, in amended independent claim 11 and claims 12, 13 and 15-20 depending therefrom, claim:

11. A video conferencing circuit for use with a plurality of video output devices and a video input device, said video conferencing circuit comprising:

video output means **configured to select one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal;**
a remote interface circuit;
a video input device; and
an application specific integrated circuit (ASIC) connected to said video input device, to said video output means and to said remote interface circuit, said ASIC having:
a video-in circuit connected to said video input device to receive a video input signal from said video input device,
a memory circuit . . . , data compression means . . . , video processing means . . . , video decompression means . . . , and
video image out circuit connected to receive incoming stored data from said memory circuit and **to transmit** said incoming stored data as a video image signal **to said one of said plurality of video output devices** of said video output means. (Emphasis added.)

Applicants' invention as claimed selects **“one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal”** and that selected one of the video output devices alone receives the output video signal.

In contrast, Bush does not disclose selection of a video output device from among a plurality of video output devices (see above arguments regarding the teachings of Bush).

Bush matches one video signal with one audio signal and mixes them together to maintain synchronicity between the video and the corresponding audio. Bush does not disclose a **“video output means configured to select one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal . . . ”** as claimed by Applicants. Additionally, Bush is not motivated to select a video output device from among a plurality of video output devices as Bush is motivated to “mix” signals rather than “select one” video output device.

Regarding the Nakajima reference, Nakajima, as detailed above, discloses mixing signals

as opposed to selecting output devices. Specifically, Nakajima discloses “TV cameras 1a and 1b for [local] [] control[], the . . . **output from the cameras 1a and 1b** is synchronized with a separation picture by a synchronizing signal converter 12 controlled by the separation generator 10 **and supplied to respective mixers 11a and 11b**. To respective displaying monitors 7a and 7b, the split picture of an **opponent side picture is mixed** and displayed and an own place side picture is mixed and displayed to the ineffective part of the monitors 7a and 7b.” (Abstract).

Specifically, Nakajima and Bush both disclose “mixing” signals rather than “selecting” a video output device. Since neither Bush nor Nakajima either individually or in any proper combination teach or suggest a “**video output means configured to select one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal . . .**” as claimed by Applicants in amended independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that any rejection of the presently claimed invention based upon any combination of the Bush reference and the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, presently amended independent claim 11, and claims 12-20 depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the cited prior art of the Bush reference in view of the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 22-24

Applicants, in amended independent claim 22 and claims 23 and 24 depending therefrom, claim:

22. A video conferencing circuit for use with a plurality of video input devices and a plurality of video output devices, said video conferencing circuit comprising:

video input means **configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices;**

a remote interface circuit;

video output means **configured to select one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal**; and
an application specific integrated circuit (ASIC) connected to said video input means, to said video output device and to said remote interface circuit, said ASIC having means programmable
to receive **said input video signal in a separate video signal format each** from one of a plurality of separate video input devices,
to store . . . , to compress . . . , to output . . . , to receive . . . , to decompress . . . , to store . . . , and to output the decompressed data through said video output means for display by one of said plurality of video output devices.
(Emphasis added.)

As described above, Applicants' invention as claimed includes a **"video input means configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices"** and that selected input video signal is individually passed and processed through the other elements of the invention as claimed.

In contrast, Bush discloses:

a video telephone system in which . . . [v]ideo and audio information are transmitted simultaneously by means of a composite signal that includes a mixture of both video data and audio data . . . so that expensive synchronization hardware need not be incorporated . . . (Col. 4, lines 39-51).

Bush matches one video signal with one audio signal and mixes them together to maintain synchronicity between the video and the corresponding audio. Bush does not disclose **"select[ing] an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices . . ."** as claimed by Applicants. Additionally, Bush is not motivated to select a video signal from among a plurality of video signals as Bush is motivated to "mix" signals rather than "select one" signal. Furthermore, Bush does not disclose **"select[ing] one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal . . ."** as claimed by Applicants.

Regarding the Nakajima reference, Nakajima discloses a video conferencing system that is able to discard the extra video display that was previously dedicated for displaying the local (“own place”) video signal. Nakajima does so by superimposing the image of the local video signal in a lesser-important portion of the video display dedicated to projecting the remote video signal in a video conferencing configuration. Nakajima further discloses that the conferencing system on the local and remote sides of the conference includes: “TV cameras 1a and 1b for [local] [] control[], the . . . **output from the cameras 1a and 1b** is synchronized with a separation picture by a synchronizing signal converter 12 controlled by the separation generator 10 **and supplied to respective mixers 11a and 11b**. To respective displaying monitors 7a and 7b, the split picture of an **opponent side picture is mixed** and displayed and an own place side picture is mixed and displayed to the ineffective part of the monitors 7a and 7b.” (Abstract).

Specifically, Nakajima and Bush both disclose “mixing” the multiple signals rather than “selecting one” of the multiple signals or devices. Since neither Bush nor Nakajima either individually or in any proper combination teach or suggest a **“video input means configured to select an input video signal from one of a plurality of video signal generating devices . . .”** or **“video output means configured to select one of a plurality of video output devices to receive an output video signal”** as claimed by Applicants in amended independent claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that any rejection of the presently claimed invention based upon any combination of the Bush reference and the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, presently amended independent claim 22, and claims 23 and 24 depending therefrom, are clearly allowable over the cited prior art of the Bush reference in view of the Nakajima reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,539,452 to Bush et al. and JP 01-252087A to Nakajima as applied to Claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of JP 08-307514A to Minamizawa et al.

Claims 4 and 14

Claims 4 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bush et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,452) and Nakajima (JP 01-252087A) as applied to Claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Minamizawa et al. (JP 08-307514A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 4 indirectly depends from now-allowable amended independent claim 1 and claim 14 indirectly depends from now-allowable amended independent claim 11. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 4 and 14 are allowable over the cited references and the rejections thereof should be withdrawn.

Objections to Claims 10 and 19

Claims 10 and 19 stand objected to. Applicants have amended claims 10 and 19 to correct the identified typographical errors. Applicants respectfully request the objections to claims 10 and 19 be withdrawn.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 19 and 22 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 20 and 22 through 24 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin K. Johanson
Registration No. 38,506
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: July 30, 2003
KKJ/dlm:dh

N:\2862\3750.1\2862-3750.1.us Amd.doc